



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/474,660	12/29/1999	JAMES L. LANSFORD	42390.P7301	2532

7590 04/30/2003

DAVID J KAPLAN
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD 7TH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025

EXAMINER

BANGACHON, WILLIAM L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2635

DATE MAILED: 04/30/2003

14

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

14

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/474,660

Applicant(s)

LANSFORD ET AL. 

Examiner

William Bangachon

Art Unit

2635

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 10 April 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-2,4,7-30.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: applicant's arguments with regards to claims 1, 10, 17, 22, and 26 (page 5, 1st paragraph and page 10, 2nd paragraph) are not persuasive. The claim limitation "a contention free period" is broad. Smith teaches a frequency-hopping radio communication system wherein a control unit (analogous to the claimed first device) assigns different frequencies and time slots to a plurality of slave stations (analogous to the claimed second and third device) to ensure that none of the stations use the same frequency and time slot for transmission to and reception from the control unit. Clearly, this is analogous to defining "a contention free period" between the plurality of stations, otherwise, interference may result (see summary of invention). The claimed "outside of a contention free period" is analogous to a first frequency / time slot assigned to a slave station and the claimed "during a contention free period" is analogous to a second frequency / time slot assigned to another slave station. i.e. A first slave station is communicating with the control unit at a first frequency. A second frequency / time slot would therefore be a contention free period. So that when a second slave station need to communicate with the control unit, the second slave station will be assigned the second frequency / time slot. In this case, a third frequency / time slot would be a contention free period in which a third slave station can communicate with the control unit {see claim rejections in the previous Office Action}.

MICHAEL HORABIK
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

